



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

as at Princeton, has acquired a catholicity of view that is certainly worthy of mention. Although one gathers the author's friendliness for Mr. Cleveland's type of Democracy in his last volume, even here he is moderate and careful in his judgments.

FREDERICK J. TURNER.

A History of the United States. By CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS and WILLIAM P. TRENT. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon. 1903. Pp. xxiii, 590.)

THE last literary work of the late President Adams was a school history of the United States. In this undertaking he was associated with Professor Trent of Columbia University. The book has been five years in the making, and the manuscript was finished and about half the proof corrected at the time of President Adams's death. Three principal objects in writing it are set forth in the preface:

"First, to present fully and with fairness the Southern point of view in the great controversies that long threatened to divide the Union. Second, to treat the Revolutionary war, and the causes that led to it, impartially and with more regard for British contentions than has been usual among American writers. Third, to emphasize the importance of the West in the growth and development of the United States."

The growth and influence of the West are as fully and adequately treated as space would admit. The point of view of the South may be said to be partially stated, and the text is supplemented by references to Southern books, which, however, are not likely to be called into requisition. But it can scarcely be said that the British point of view during the Revolution has been stated at all. Barring a single paragraph on the theory of representation, the treatment of the American Revolution is the traditional one. The reference to the Navigation Laws is inaccurate and inadequate. The King is held to have been alone responsible for the loss of the American colonies. It is not explained that the proceeds of the stamp tax were to be expended in the colonies and were not expected to meet more than a third of the expense of the colonial establishment. There is no comment upon the revolutionary character of the "tea-party." The account of the Transportation Act confuses different things and perpetuates an old misconception. It should be stated that the only persons to be removed for trial were those accused of crime on account of acts performed in the discharge of their official duty, a provision not materially different from the one in the statutes of the United States, which was enforced in the Neagle case. It cannot therefore be said that the special purposes of the book have been wholly attained.

The text is intended to meet the requirements of the high-school course suggested by the Committee of Seven and already very widely adopted. What may best be done in this course is still a matter of experiment. The present book follows closely the lines of the grade texts. The colonies are treated briefly and the campaigns of the Revolution and

the Rebellion very fully. We should prefer a different distribution of matter, upon the ground that the war story is the part of the work that may best be done in the grammar grades. The mode of treatment is to give a continuous narrative in the text, and a series of condensed biographies in the foot-notes. This expedient economizes space and preserves the continuity of the story. The style is clear and the paragraphs short, so that the book is likely to prove eminently usable in recitation.

In covering so large a field, it is inevitable that some errors should occur. Waldseemüller did not propose to name the West Indies after Columbus. It is well settled that Coronado did not penetrate as far north as the Nebraska boundary. Raleigh was the half-brother instead of the brother-in-law of Gilbert. La Salle did not ascend the Mississippi River to the Falls of St. Anthony. It has been shown that the Charleston tea did not spoil in damp cellars but was subsequently sold for the benefit of the revolutionary cause. The treaty of Paris provided for the northern boundary of the United States, though difficulties in its application afterward arose. The charge that British intrigues before the War of 1812 stirred the Western Indians to revolt is unsupported by evidence. The treaty of 1819 ceded West as well as East Florida. It can scarcely be said that "incipient efforts to divide the nation were crushed under Jackson," since the issue was compromised. The John Brown murders occurred on Pottawattomie Creek. West Virginia was not admitted until June 19, 1863. An account of the nominating conventions of 1864 is inadvertently omitted. "Potomac" for James in the account of the Peninsula campaign, "twenty-five" for fifty-five in the statement of the height of the Washington Monument, and "Garland" for Gorham in the references are misprints, and there are a few others that are more evident. Most of the errors are of slight importance and may be easily corrected in a new edition.

The portraits used to illustrate the text have been carefully selected and are admirably reproduced, making the best collection that has appeared in a book of the kind. It would have been worth while to indicate their date and source. There is a large number of maps but they contain the errors common to maps in the school histories. A curious example of these errors may be found in the location of Vincennes. Some initial map placed it south of the White River, and nearly all the school histories, including the present one, repeat the mistake. A map illustrating the Compromise of 1850, apparently based upon one in McMaster's school history, omits a necessary explanation which McMaster gives. It is also incorrect, in that it represents that territory not within the limits of Utah and New Mexico was opened to slavery by this compromise. A map illustrating the Kansas-Nebraska Act incorrectly represents both the northern and southern boundaries of Kansas Territory. A map of the United States in 1861, also apparently based upon McMaster, represents the Sierra Nevada as the western boundary of Nevada Territory, and the Owyhee as part of the eastern boundary of Oregon, two boundaries that never existed, though they may possibly have been

represented on contemporary maps. The act organizing Nevada Territory provided that the western boundary should follow the mountains in case California should consent, but California never consented. When the attention of a well-known author was called not long ago to the inaccuracy of the maps in one of his books, he replied that he had nothing to do with the maps and that the publishers alone were responsible for them. Whether it is the publishers who are responsible for the maps in the school histories does not appear.

F. H. HODDER.

A History of American Political Theories. By CHARLES EDWARD MERRIAM, Ph.D. (New York: The Macmillan Company; London: Macmillan and Company. 1903. Pp. xv, 364.)

DR. MERRIAM is already known to those interested in the history of political theories by his doctoral dissertation, *A History of the Theory of Sovereignty since Rousseau*, and by magazine articles dealing respectively with the political views of Jefferson, Calhoun, and Paine. In the present work he has essayed to trace the course of political speculations in this country from early colonial times to the present day. He has given us, however, a sketch rather than a comprehensive history; indeed, to have done more within the limited number of pages occupied would have been impossible. Judged, then, from this standpoint, the work is excellent, and our criticisms of it will be found to be almost wholly based upon acts of omission and not upon those of commission. The language is clear and concise, though there are a number of unnecessary repetitions, the arrangement is logical, continuity in the various lines of development is sufficiently shown, and, most important of all, the direct relation of the theories to contemporaneous objective political conditions is made manifest.

The work begins with a chapter entitled "The Political Theory of the Colonial Period." This broad title, however, is hardly justified, for except for four pages given to the Quakers and an equal number to an account of the rise of democratic sentiments among the colonists, the discussion is limited to the political theories of the New England Puritans. A bare reference to the aristocratic utterances of Governor Spotswood of Virginia is all that is furnished us regarding the characteristic views of the Southern colonists. Furthermore, we are given no account of the political theories involved in the discussions as to the extent to which and the manner in which the English common law became a part of the private law of the colonies. In the account of the political theories of the Revolutionary period, which is the topic next taken up, an excellent exposition of the then current principles of natural laws and constitutional rights is presented, the gradual emphasizing of the former at the expense of the latter being well brought out. The theories of the Loyalists are, however, hardly adequately treated, Boucher being the only writer of that party who is even mentioned by name. Dr. Merriam cor-